Hal Verb
P.O. Box 421815
S.F., CA. 94142-1815

12-23-95

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD. 21702

Dear Hal:

This entire next week I have off from work so I can devote more time on looking at particular items I've wanted to check out. I am taking your suggestion seriously about doing a book on the first shot evidence and I've done a brief outline of the sources to use. Naturally, your books will be cited. When I do come up with a near-completed text I'll submit it to you for suggestions, errors, etc. Of course, I'll need to be writing to many different people to see if I can get their observations, comments (devoting comments strictly to the "first shot evidence" approach. Besides yourself, others I'll be in touch with include Ray Marcus, Gene Case, Don Olsen and Doug DeSellis. All agree with the first shot thesis I'm proposing with only Doug dissenting on the originating point.

In case you may not recall Olsen wrote an article back in the early 1970's utilizing graphs and his background in physics to demonstrate the validity of the hypothesis and Gene Case is the person I met at COPA this year who did a

detailed video analysis of the blurring effects of the Z-film. I sent you a copy of his article which appeared in the COPA abstract bulletin they published in 1995. You should have it.

Case and I have been in contact and he recently sent me an up-dated draft of a proposed article he's doing disproving the Alvarez analysis of the Z-film. I would've sent you a copy but he asked me not to send any copies out to anyone <u>until</u> he gets it published. I did ask Case for permission to use it and/or refer to it in my proposed book & he agreed. Combined with the other sources I'm now going through I think I can say that my proposed book will be "definitive" on the first shot. With so many of the so-called "critics" getting it wrong and hopelessly "far out" one can, at last, go to one single source and cite it as primary. I <u>hope</u> I can do this, at least.

As far as other events happening there is little to report. I did get your note about using the Max Holland article for some of your chapters. Towards that end, I'm enclosing a hand-written letter I wrote to the "American Heritage" about the Holland article. I've had no reply but I'll study future issues to see what the letters to the editor do say.

Also enclosed is the November 1995 issue of "CONSPIRACY" (complete) printed by COPA plus some articles and letters to the editor which you should find of interest. Note the article on the new Livingstone book in which article you are quoted.

Gary Aguilar told me that Dennis Brevis proposed book has been cancelled. Gary didn't tell me what the reason was but it would be interesting to know why.

Gary and I submitted two articles to the local bay area "alternative" newspaper here (the "Bay Guardian") and that was a month ago. After repeated calls to one of the editors who told me they're "working on it" not a word has appeared. It could be they're scared as Gary's thrust was to nail "JAMA" (& the AMA in turn) for their atrocious handling in the "JAMA" issues. My article was a criticism of the ARRB upheld objectively (I could've been a lot harder but was thinking of how the "Bay Guardian" would react if it were more hard-hitting. In retrospect, since they've not published it, apparently this made no difference). The "Bay Guardian" tries to present itself as a fearless journal that dares to counter "establishment" papers but it is easily cowed. Just to give you an example of the kind of stories they did print within the last month was a "fluff" piece on a reporter who "infiltrated" a meeting of retired intelligence officers and another article on "the best beers to buy in S.F." (was this aimed for Joe Sixpack??). So far my calls have been unanswered as to what they will be doing with our articles.

And speaking about our "do nothing" journals, I've been receiving as you probably are the ARRB announcements about what they're up to. One of their latest reports says that documents the ARRB have turned up relate to "HSCA payroll records"! Astounding! This certainly is one way of getting to the bottom of the whole case!

I should note here that from time to time I've noted that the envelope I receive containing the ARRB

Reports has been torn open (as if to see what's inside of it). Can this be an example of the government spying upon itself??! Well, maybe they'll learn something from reading the contents — who knows!

You had in a previous letter asked if I knew of someone at "Rolling Stone" magazine but I do not. Someone like Paul Krassner would be your best bet as he knows this area better than I.

One final note and this bears on Norman Mailer. The latest issue of "The N.Y. Review of Books" (9/11/96) has a book review of Mailer's latest book on Picasso. The article is by Roger Shattuck who happens to be President of the Association of Literary Scholars and Critics.

Shattuck points out that Mailer's preface to his new book lays claim to "no original scholarship". And prior to this Shattuck refers to Mailer's "lazy assumptions". I thought you'd get a kick out of these references to Mailer. Incidentally, Mailer was severely taken to task for his book on Picasso in an issue of the "Nation". Since you said you subscribe to it you may have seen it. The "Nation" article goes much further than the NY Review does.

Well, that is all for now I can think of. I hope your work is coming along & I will keep you posted on my efforts.

Best,

Hal Verb